



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,850	12/12/2003	John Charles Calhoun	003797.00691	9029

28319 7590 08/24/2006

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797
1001 G STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

BERHANU, SAMUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2838

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/733,850	CALHOON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Samuel Berhanu	2838	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/09/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stephens (US 5,734,254).

Regarding Claim 8, Stephens discloses in Figures 2 and 3, an apparatus configured for receiving inductive energy and providing power to a host device, comprising: a memory for storing computer readable data (295) relevant to receiving the inductive energy; a processor unit (295) for processing the computer readable data and for processing data communications with a computer system; a coil configured for receiving the inductive energy (283) and for receiving inductive data; a power supply (284) operatively coupled to the coil and receiving the inductive energy from the coil, the power supply configured to convert the inductive energy from the coil to a direct current ; a power port (+DC Out, in figure 2), for receiving the direct current from the power supply and outputting the direct current from the power supply to a host device transfer means for the charger and the device or the battery pack.

Regarding Claim 10, Stephens discloses the apparatus, comprising a communications device (20) operatively coupled to the pickup coil (32).

Regarding Claim 11, Stephens discloses the apparatus, in which the communications device (20) is configured to receive the computer readable data and transmit the data to the pick up coil (32).

3. Claims 9,13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (US 5,734,254) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding Claim 9, Stephens does not disclose explicitly, the processor unit is configured to provide authentication data for inductive energy reception. However, Stobbe discloses except the processor unit is configured to provide authentication data for inductive energy reception (Column 6, lines 5-20). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Stephens battery pack and adapter system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

Regarding Claim 13, Stephens does not disclose explicitly, a processor unit is Configured to receive a digital security certificate from a power adapter Stobbe discloses a processor unit (18) is Configured to receive a digital security certificate from a power adapter (Column 6, lines 5-20). However, Stobbe discloses a processor unit (18) is Configured to receive a digital security certificate from a power adapter (Column 6, lines 5-20). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Stephens wireless battery charging system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

Regarding Claim 15, Stobbe discloses an antenna (52) and a communications device (22,24) configured to receive the computer readable data and configured to transmit the data to the antenna for wireless data communications a charging source (Column 5, lines 35-45).

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (US 5,734,254) in view of Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012).

Regarding Claim 12, Stephens does not disclose explicitly, the processor unit is configured to provide a plurality of power parameters to a power source, which provides the inductive energy. However, Garcia et al. disclose except the processor unit is configured to provide a plurality of power parameters to a power source which provides the inductive energy. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Stephen's battery pack and adapter system in order to transmit battery parameters as taught by Garcia et al. so that the device can make any necessary charging adjustments.

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (US 5,734,254) in view of Higuchi et al. (US 6,163,132).

Regarding Claim 14, Stephens does not disclose explicitly, the processor unit is configured to send data to the computer system so as to indicate it is receiving inductive energy. However, Higuchi discloses in Figure1 the processor unit (4b) is configured to send data to the computer system (5) so as to indicate it is receiving inductive energy (Column 4, lines 33-38). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a computing and indicating system in

Art Unit: 2838

Stephens battery pack apparatus as taught by Higuchi et al. in order to monitor battery status.

6. Claim 16,17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254)

Regarding Claim 16, Garcia et al disclose in Figures 2 and 3 a computer implemented method of providing inductive energy to a power adapter, comprising the step of: in a transmission element wirelessly receiving a polling message from a source (Column 2, lines 47-59); transmitting a request for power to the source via said transmission element (204) responsive to the polling message; and receiving inductive power from the source via said transmission element responsive to the transmitted request. (Noted that the receiving and the transmitting devices exchange data via a wireless communication means, when data is verified electrical action such as charging or providing energy executes). Garcia et al. do not disclose explicitly, converting the inductive power to a direct current; and outputting the direct current via a power port to a host device. However, Stephens discloses in Figures 2 and 3, converting the inductive power to a direct current (283); and outputting the direct current via a power port to a host device (290, outputting a DC signal to the electronic devices such as notebook circuits, and also in Figure 2 Stephens shows a DC port to the device). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add an AC/DC converter in Garcia et. al. inductive charger apparatus as taught by Stephens in order to regulate the charging current for safety purpose and provide

adjustable charging current for the battery, and further add a power connection means to distribute the charging current to different electronic devices .

Regarding Claim 17, Garcia et al. disclose the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting power parameters to the source (column 2, lines 47-59).

Regarding Claim 19, Garcia et al. disclose, a step of initiating a charger responsive to the step of receiving (Column 2, lines 30-59).

7. Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254) as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding Claim 18, neither Garcia et al. nor Stephens discloses, the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. However, Stobbe discloses the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Garcia et al. wireless battery charging system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254) as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Parks et al. (US 5,455,466).

Regarding Claim 19, neither Garcia et al. nor Stephens discloses a step of converting the inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving. However, Parks et al. disclose in Figure 1 a step of initiating a step of converting the

inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving (Column 2, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a charging rectifier circuit in Garcia et al wireless battery charging system as taught by Parks et al. in order to supply direct current appropriate for charging the battery pack.

9. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254) as applied to Claim 16 above, and further in view of Higuchi et al. (US 6,163,132).

Regarding Claim 20, neither Garcia et al. nor Stephens discloses a step of transmitting data to a computer system for indicating the step of receiving inductive power. However, Higuchi et al disclose in Figures 1 and 2 a step of transmitting data to a computer system for indicating the step of receiving inductive power (Column 4, lines 33-38). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a computing and indicating system to the battery pack in Garcia et al. as taught by Higuchi et al. in order to monitor battery status.

Regarding Claim 21, Higuchi et al disclose in Figure 3, a step of displaying an object on a graphical user interface (6) indicative of the step of receiving (Column 4, lines 60-63).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 06/09/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, or moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that Stephens does not teach or suggest a direct current to a power port that outputs the direct current from the power supply to a host device, and converting inductive energy from the coil to a direct current and outputting the direct current to a host device. This is incorrect. Stephens discloses in Figure 2, a power port (**DC Out**) that outputs the direct current from the power supply (140) to a host device (190), and also in Figure 3, Stephens discloses converting inductive energy from the coil (283) to a direct current (284, outputs direct current) and outputting the direct current to a host device (**To Notebook Circuits**).

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel Berhanu whose telephone number is 571-272-8430. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on 571-272-1989. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SB


KARL EASTHOM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER